#### DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 428 CG 024 769

AUTHOR Burkholder. Janiece

TITLE Pumsy in Pursuit of Excellence and Self-Concept of

Second Grade Students.

PUB DATE [24 Aug 92]

77p.; M.S. Thesis, Fort Hays State University. NOTE PUB TYPE

Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS \*Counseling Effectiveness; Elementary School

Students; \*Grade 2; Primary Education; \*Program Effectiveness; \*School Counseling; Self Concept;

\*Self Esteem

Pumsy in Pursuit of Excellence IDENTIFIERS

#### **ABSTRACT**

This practicum evaluated the effects a self-esteem program, Pumsy in Pursuit of Excellence, which was implemented by the elementary school counselor with second grade students (N=65). Forty-five second grade students comprised the control group. The Pumsy in Pursuit of Excellence Units include: (1) Pumsy Decides; (2) If Only Things Were Different; (3) I Can't Stand It! (4) I'm No Good; (5) It's Not My Fault; (6) Why Didn't It Work; (7) But What If I Say No; and (8) Pumsy Helps Friend. The independent variables investigated were participation status, gender, family structure, and Chapter 1 reading status. The dependent variables were posttest scores from the following subscales of the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale: Behavior, Intellectual & School Status, Physical Appearance & Attributes, Anxiety, Popularity, and Happiness & Satisfaction. The covariant measures were pretest scores from the previous subscales of the Piers-Harris and the Science Research Associates Survey of Basic Skills Reading total score. Of the 42 comparisons made, 3 were statistically significant. Two of the three significant comparisons indicated that participants in the program had higher adjusted post mean scores for Intellectual & School Status and Anxiety than nonparticipants. The remaining significant comparison indicated that the participants in Chapter 1 reading had a higher adjusted post means score for intellectual & School Status. The appendixes include a listing of the unit objectives. (Contains 23 references.) (ABL)



Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made

from the original document. 

# PUMSY IN PURSUIT OF EXCELLENCE AND SELF-CONCEPT OF SECOND GRADE STUDENTS

being

A Thesis Presented to the Graduate Faculty
of the Fort Hays State University in

Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Science

by

Janiece Burkholder

B.S., Fort Hays State University

| IJa | <sup>+</sup> e | Approved |       |           |  |
|-----|----------------|----------|-------|-----------|--|
|     |                |          | Major | Professor |  |
|     |                |          |       |           |  |
|     |                |          |       |           |  |

Approved \_\_\_\_\_\_ Chair, Graduate Council

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Janiece Burkholder

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) "

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

.

# Graduate Committee Approval

The Thesis Committee of Janiece Burkholder hereby approves her thesis as meeting partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Science.

| Ann                                     | roved  |            |           |         |  |
|---|--------|------------|-----------|---------|--|
| *************************************** |        | Chair, Gra | iduate Co | mmittee |  |
| Арр                                     | roved  | Committee  |           |         |  |
| Арр                                     | roved  | Committee  | Member    |         |  |
| Арр                                     | proved | Committee  | Member    |         |  |
| Date                                    | _      |            |           |         |  |



## Acknowledgments

Sincere appreciation is expressed to the people who have given their time and assistance in the development of this thesis study. A special thanks is given to Dr. Bill Daley for his advice and guidance. The writer is grateful to Dr. Robert Chalender, Dr. Thomas Guss, and Dr. James Stansbury for their suggestions, comments, and recommendations.

Much appreciation is expressed to the researcher's family and friends for all their support and encouragement. A special thanks to Leslie Schonthaler for implementing the program. Also, much appreciation goes to the family computer experts, Eileen Wineland and Jeremy Burkholder. A great thank you to the researcher's sons, J.B. and Jeremy, for their patience. A very special thanks goes to my husband, Mike Burkholder, for his unending patience, understanding, and support.



# Table of Contents

|  |     |   |   |   | Page |
|--|-----|---|---|---|------|
| Introduction                               |     | • |   | • | 1    |
| Overview                                   |     |   |   |   | 1    |
| Family structure, gender, and self-concept | •   |   |   |   | 3    |
| Achievement in reading and self-concept .  |     |   |   |   | 5    |
| Interventions to enhance self-concept      |     |   |   |   | 9    |
| Summary                                    |     |   |   |   | 12   |
| Statement of the Problem                   |     |   |   |   | 13   |
| Importance of the Research                 | •   |   |   |   | 13   |
| Composite Null Hypotheses                  |     |   |   |   | 14   |
| Definitions of Variables                   |     | • |   |   | 15   |
| Independent Variables                      |     | • |   |   | 15   |
| Dependent Variables                        |     |   |   |   | 16   |
| Covariant Measures                         |     |   | • |   | 17   |
| Limitations                                |     |   |   |   | 17   |
| Methodology                                | •   |   | • |   | 18   |
| Setting                                    |     |   | • |   | 18   |
| Subjects                                   |     |   |   |   | 18   |
| Instruments                                |     | • | • |   | 1 9  |
| Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Sc    | ale | е | • |   | 1 9  |
| Science Research Associates, Survey of     |     |   |   |   |      |
| Basic Skills                               |     |   |   |   | 21   |



|       | Design  |    | •  | •   | •  |     | •  | •  | •  | •   | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • |   |   |   |    | 22  |
|-------|---------|----|----|-----|----|-----|----|----|----|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|
|       | Impleme | nt | at | i o | n  | ٠.  |    |    |    | •   | • |   | • |   | • |   |   | • |   | • |   |   | ٠. | 24  |
|       | Data Co | 11 | ес | ti  | ng | P   | rc | CE | du | ıre | s |   | • | • | • |   | • |   | • |   |   |   |    | 25  |
|       | Researc | h  | Pr | oc  | ed | lur | es | 3  |    |     | • |   | • |   | • | • | • | • |   |   |   | • |    | 26  |
|       | Data An | al | уs | is  |    |     |    | •  |    |     | • |   | • |   |   | • |   |   |   |   |   | • |    | 27  |
| Resul | ts      | •  | •  |     |    |     | •  |    |    |     |   |   |   | • |   |   |   |   |   |   | • | • | •  | 27  |
| Discu | noisa   |    |    | •   |    |     |    | •  |    | •   |   |   | • |   |   | • |   |   |   |   |   |   | •  | 47  |
| Dofor | concoa  |    |    |     |    |     |    |    |    |     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | E 1 |



# List of Tables

|          |   | Page |
|----------|---|------|
| Table 1: | A Comparison of Adjusted Post Mean Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale Scores (PHCSCS) According to Participation Status with PHCSCS Pretest Scores as a Covariant Measure Employing a One-way Analysis of Covariance                    | . 30 |
| Table 2  | A Comparison of Adjusted Post Mean<br>Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept<br>Scale Scores (PHCSCS) According to<br>Participation Status with SRA Reading<br>Total Scores as a Covariant Measure<br>Employing a One-way Analysis of Covariance. | . 33 |
| Table 3  | A Comparison of Adjusted Post Mean Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale Scores (PHCSCS) According to Gender with PHCSCS Pretest Scores as a Covariant Measure Employing a One-way Analysis of Covariance                                  | . 36 |
| Table 4  | A Comparison of Adjusted Post Mean Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale Scores According to Gender with SRA Reading Total Scores as a Covariant Measu/re Employing a One-way Analysis of Covarian¢e.                                      | . 39 |
| Table 5  | A Comparison of Adjusted Post Mean Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale Scores (PHCSCS) According to Chapter I Status with PHCSCS Pretest Scores as a Covariant Measure Employing a One-way Analysis of Covariance                        | . 42 |
| Table 6  | : A Comparison of Adjusted Post Mean Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale Scores (PHCSCS) According to Family Structure with PHCSCS Pretest Scores as a Covariant Measure Employing a One-way Analysis of Covariance                      | . 45 |



# List of Appendixes

| Appe   | endix  | Page |
|--------|--|------|
| Α.     | Pumsy in Pursuit of Excellence Unit Objectives | 54   |
| В.     | Administrative Permission Letters              | 58   |
| $\sim$ | Parental Permission Letters                    | 63   |



## Abstract

The purpose of the researcher was to investigate a self-esteem program implemented by the elementary school counselor with second grade students. The independent variables investigated were participation status levels: experimental and control groups); gender levels); family structure (two levels: intact and other); and Chapter I reading status (two levels: participant and nonparticipant). The dependent variables were posttest scores from the following subscales of the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale: Behavior, Intellectual & School Status, Physical Appearance & Attributes, Anxiety, Popularity, and Happiness & Satisfaction. The covariant measures were pretest scores from the previous subscales of the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale and the SRA Survey of Basic Skills Reading Total score. The sample consisted of 110 second grade students. Six composite null hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance. Each composite null hypothesis was tested with a one-way analysis of covariance.

Of the 42 comparisons made, 3 were statistically significant at the .05 level. Two of the 3 significant comparisons indicated that participants in the program had higher adjusted post mean scores for Intellectual & School Status and Anxiety than nonparticipants. The remaining significant comparison indicated that the participants in



viii

Chapter I reading had a higher adjusted post means score for Intellectual & School Status.

The results of the present study appeared to support the following generalizations:

- (1) Participation status (Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale Scores as covariant measure) was associated with 2 dimensions of self-concept (Intellectual & School Status and Anxiety).
- (2) Participation status (SRA Reading Total Score as covariant measure) was not associated with self-concept.
- (3) For those who participated in the implementation (Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale Scores as covariant measure) gender was not associated with self-concept.
- (4) For those who participated in the implementation (SRA Reading Total Score as covariant measure) gender was not associated with self-concept.
- (5) For those who participated in the implementation (Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale Scores as covariant measure) Chapter I was associated with 1 dimension of self-concept (Intellectual & School Status.
- (6) For those who participated in the implementation (Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale Scores as covariant measure) family structure was not associated with self-concept.



## Introduction

## Overview

Self-concept has received much attention l n psychological and educational literature. Psychologists and educators have generally agreed that self-concept has a pervasive influence on the individual's total development (Briggs, 1970). Brookover (1964) and Purkey (1970) advocated the establishment of programs to develop improved self-concept. Numerous studies have been conducted at the elementary school level concerning attempts to foster children's self-concept (Dobson, Campbell, & Dobson, 1982; Durbin, 1982: Eldridge, Barcikowski, & Witmer, 1973: Hadley, 1988; Morse, Bockoven, & Bettesworth, 1988; Summerlin, Hammett, & Payne, 1983; Weinhold & Hilferty, 1983: Wrenn, 1980; all cited by Stafford & Hill, 1989).

Phillips (1983) defined self-concept as the way one sees self and the degree of self acceptance. Phillips continued by maintaining that self-concept involves one's beliefs, attitudes and feelings towards the self. It includes ideas, attitudes, values, commitments, and positive and negative character descriptions.

Rogers (1959, cited by Patterson, 1986, pp. 382-383) defined self-concept as:



1

the organized, consistent conceptual gestalt composed of perceptions of the characteristics of the 'I' or 'me' and the perceptions of the relationships of the 'I' or 'me' to others and the various aspects of life, together with the values attached to these perceptions. Self-concept is dependent upon the evaluations and perceptions of others as perceived by the individual.

Silvernail (1985) maintained that self-esteem and self-concept have been used interchangeably. Self-esteem is defined as a positive or negative attitude. This attitude includes feelings of personal worth that are influenced by performance, abilities, appearance, and judgement of important others. Self-concept is defined as the sum total of all the characteristics a person attributes to himself and any positive or negative values he attaches to these attributes.

Although self-esteem and self-concept have been used interchangeably in the literature, there are distinctions which further clarify the 2 concepts. Self-esteem is often seen as the evaluative part of self-concept. Coopersmith (1967, p.5) stated.

By self-esteem we refer to the evaluation which an individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself; it expresses an attitude



of approval or disapproval, and indicates the extent to which the individual believes himself to be capable, significant, successful, and worthy.

In the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale Revised Manual, Piers (1984, p. 1) defined self-concept as.

a relatively stable set of self-attitudes reflecting both a description and an evaluation of one's own behavior and attributes.

. . . this definition is consistent with what Wylie . . . refers to as a phenomenological view of "self-concept" and, . . . is interchangeable with the terms self-esteem and self-regard.

## Family structure, gender, and self-concept

Parish (1991) found a significantly higher self-concept for youths from intact families in comparison with those from divorced, remarried families. Six-hundred and forty-eight youths (274 males, 374 females) from the state of Kansas evaluated themselves and their parents. The youths ranged in age from 10 to 18 and were selected from 14 Kansas school systems. The instrument used was the Personal Attribute Inventory. The subjects were asked to check the 15 adjectives (from 48 alphabetical arranged adjectives, 24 positive and 24 negative) that best described themselves, their mothers, and their fathers. A statistically significant interaction was found between the independent



variables of marital status x gender [(F(2,636)=3.78, p < .05)]. The statistically significant interaction indicated the self-concept for male youths appeared highest among those from divorced nonremarried families, and lowest from divorced, remarried families. For female youths, self-concept was clearly the highest for those from intact families.

Hutchinson (1987) conducted a similar study with institutionalized children from intact, divorced, step-families. A total of 166 children (80 males and 86 females) in grades 5 through 12 participated in the study. Fifty-one were from intact families, 54 from step-families, and 61 from divorced families. The Personal Attribute Inventory was used to survey the children. Hutchinson (1987, p.9) reported the following: "The chi-square analysis revealed that children from intact families were significantly more likely to describe themselves as happy (x2 = 9.97, p < .01), kind (x2 = 6.04, p < .05), and nice (x2 = 6.04, p < .05)= 9.41, p <.01) than were children from stepfamilies or from divorced single-parent families." The highest self-concept mean score of 12.19 was recorded by children from intact families and the lowest self-concept mean score of 11.26 was divorced single-parent families. The recorded from differences, however, were not statistically significantly at the .05 level. Although a trend was found in these studies indicating that children from intact families may



have slightly higher self-concepts, a statistically significant difference was not found.

Johnson & Hutchinson (1987) conducted a study to examine the effects of family structure on children's self-concepts using Parish's Personal Attribute Inventory for children The PAIC and a demographic questionnaire were (PAIC). completed by 199 students (82 boys, 117 girls) in grades 7 through 12. The subjects attended a university-related laboratory school. The results revealed no statistically significant differences in how the subjects in the 3 different family structures (stepfamily (sf), single-parent family (sp), and intact family (if)) perceived themselves. A trend was noted that students from a stepfamily structure tended to check fewer positive adjectives on the PAIC. However, stepfamily means (Msf=11.58) did not differ significantly from the means of the single-parent families (Msp=12.16) or the means of intact families (Mif=12.45). Children from intact homes chose a slightly higher number of positive adjectives than the norm.

## Achievement in reading and self-concept

There is a large amount of research existing which demonstrates that many students who have difficulty in reading and qualify for special remedial classes also have poor self-concepts and excessive levels of anxiety.

Revicki (1982) investigated a sample of 147 second grade students (57% males, 43% females) and their families to determine the relationship between self-concept and



academic achievement. The Self Observation Scales and Stanford Achievement Test were used to measure self-concept and achievement. The Family Environment Interview Schedule represented the home environment measures. The results indicated that reading achievement scores were found to be positively associated with self-concept. The SAT Total Reading Scores possessed a direct association of .215 on the self-concept construct, while self-concept related .154 to reading achievement.

Wattenberg & Clifford (1964) concluded that poor readers tend to possess a negative self-concept and continuous reading failure may result in generalized feelings of worthlessness, self-doubt, and inferiority. The design measured the mental ability and self-concept for a group of children entering kindergarten. At the end of second grade measures of reading ability and self-concept were again obtained. The sample began with 185 students and was reduced to 128 in the follow-up measure. The measure of intellectual ability was obtained for the kindergarten students from scores on the Detroit Beginning First Grade Intelligence Test. At the end of second grade the reading tests distributed by the textbook series the students were using provided the measure of reading achievement.

As a measure of self-concept, tape recordings were made of the student's responses to incomplete sentences about family, competence, self-worth, etc.. The responses were rated as positive, negative, or neutral. The product moment



correlations for the two raters were .89 for the competence ratios (Quantified Self-Concept) and .75 for the good-bad (Quantified Self-Concept) for the kindergarten students. At the second grade level, these were .82 and .71. Of the 14 subgroup correlations between reading test scores and quantified self-concept (competence) measures, 10 were positive (2 at the .05 level). For the quantified self-concept (good-bad), 11 were positive (3 at the .05 level). The measures of self-concept taken at kindergarten level were predictive of reading achievement at the end of grade 2.

Lewis (1984) investigated the comparative effects of a structured group counseling program verses a nondirective program on emotional adjustment and reading achievement in elementary school students. Twenty-four elementary students were the participants. The sample included 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th grade students who were receiving remedial reading instruction. The students were randomly assigned to 6 groups (3 structured counseling groups and 3 nondirective counseling groups). Each group of 4 students received 8 sessions. The 40-minute sessions were held over a period of All continued to receive remedial reading weeks. instruction for 30 minutes per day. The structured group's sessions were divided into 4 components: (1) warm- up exercises; (2) video-tapes of peer and adult models of and effective coping behavior; self-disclosure discussion of video tape, and (4) Success Anticipation



Training (relaxation technique and positive suggestions regarding self-concept, anxiety reduction, and reading progress). The nondirective group's session included the same warm-up exercises and a discussion of predetermined topics involving relationships between self-concept and anxiety and reading. The leader took a nondirective role and asked general questions of the groups. The Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale, State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children, and the Diagnostic Reading Scales were the instruments used for the pretest and posttest scores. multivariate analysis of covariance was used. The data analysis indicated that the structured group produced more significant gain (F=5.32) in reading comprehension than the nondirective group. For the dependent variables οf self-concept (F=0.85) and reading rate (F=0.99) significant main effects were found. The group mean score the structured group was positive, although significant in gains in self-concept. The pretest mean score for the structured groups was 46.42 and 52.08 for the posttest mean. For the nondirective group the pretest mean score was 44.42 and posttest mean score was 46.92. These findings suggested that future refined programs include additional content emphasis on self-concept since there was a positive although not significant gain in the structured group.



## Interventions to enhance self-concept

Koval and Hales (1972) studied the effects of the Developing Understanding of Self and Others program (DUSO), [Dinkmeyer, 1970] on the self-concepts of rural Appalachian primary age children. Through the use of music, puppetry, problem solving, role playing, and storytelling, the program was designed to build more representative self-concept and feelings of adequacy in children. The participants became aware of the emotional area of their life and learned that there were reasons for human behavior.

The sample of 312 students in grades K-2 was divided into an experimental and a control group, with 1 class at each grade level randomly assigned to the DUSO program. school counselor met once a week for 10 weeks with the experimental group and conducted a 30-minute guidance lesson using the DUSO materials. Following the 10-week implementation, 4 subtests (Sense of Personal Self-Reliance, Sense of Personal Freedom, and Feeling of Belonging) of the California Test of Personality administered to the entire sample. Participants in the DUSO program (experimental group) reported showing numerically more self-reliance and having a greater feeling of belonging than did nonparticipants (control group). Also. participants at the first grade level had numerically a greater sense of personal worth.



An additional study (Eldridge, 1973) investigated the effects of DUSO on the self-concept of second grade students with the activities being led by classroom teachers. The study used more than 1 instrument to measure self-concept and statistically determine if the same results occurred with several instruments.

The 98 subjects were enrolled in 2 elementary schools. There were 2 second grade classrooms at each school and 1 class at each school was randomly chosen to be the experimental group and the other was used as the control The treatment consisted of five 30-minute sessions per week over a 5-week period using Unit 1 (Understanding and Accepting Self) of the DUSO group guidance program. A pretest (to be used as a covariant measure) and 3 posttests were given to all subjects in the study. The Children's Self-Concept Index was selected as the instrument for the covarient measure. Following the 5-week intervention using Unit 1 of DUSO, the 4 subtests of the California Test of Personality (Sense of Personal Worth, Self-Reliance. Sense of Personal Freedom, and Feeling of Belonging), the DUSO Affectivity Device, Part 1, and the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale, were given to all subjects.

The results showed that only the F ratio for the DUSO Affectivity Device was significant at the .05 level. The Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale and the first



four sections of the California Test of Personality indicated no significant differences.

Summerlin, Hammett, & Payne (1983) sought to determine whether Magic Circle participants would have more positive self-concepts than nonparticipants. The subjects were selected from 2 first grade classes and randomly assigned to an experimental or control group. The experimental group consisted of 10 females and 9 males. The control group consisted of 11 females and 9 males. The experimental group attended a 25 minute Magic Circle session 3 times a week for 3 months while the control group followed a regular class schedule. By sharing positive and negative thoughts and feelings relating to themes of awareness, mastery, and social interaction, participants were aided in development of healthy self-concepts.

One week after the final intervention the Primary Self-Concept Inventory was used to measure the children's self-concepts. A multivariate analysis of variance computed on the posttest Primary Self-Concept Inventory scores indicated that significant differences existed between the experimental and control groups (F=4.22, p<0.01). The results indicated that the experimental group had significantly higher scores than the control group on the social self domain and total self-concept.

Harmon (1989) determined the effects on self-concept, as measured by the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept



Scale, of 40 of the 89 third grade students who participated in Pumsy in Pursuit of Excellence program (Anderson, 1982). Before the start of the Pumsy program the experimental and control groups were administered the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale as a pretest measure.

During an 8 week period of time the experimental group participated in 45 minute weekly lessons taught by the school counselor. Lessons consisted of stories and activities intended to teach children positive thinking, control, choice, breaking negative thought patterns and skills to enhance self-esteem. Students in the control group did not participate in the Pumsy program.

After the completion of the 8 week Pumsy program, the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale was administered as a posttest. Results indicated no significant differences at the .05 level between the experimental and control groups. Significant statistical difference between the 2 groups was approached at the .07 level of confidence as a result of treatment.

## Summary

Numerous studies pertaining to self-concept have been implemented. The results of the studies examined led researchers to suggest that the use of a guidance program with counselor consultation can have a positive effect on self-concept development. The research examined contained information that indicated a degree of success with programs



that have been developed to enhance self-concept. Many of the studies that included the variables of gender, family structure, and reading achievement and their effect on self-concept have provided inconsistent and inconclusive results. The results of these studies examined appeared to indicate additional research is needed to identify the effect of gender, family structure, and reading achievement on self-concept.

## Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the researcher was to investigate a self-esteem program implemented by the elementary school counselor with second grade students.

## Importance of the Research

The research reviewed indicated that positive self-concept is an important component of successful education and a predictor of selected social behaviors. Interventions to enhance self-concept are valued educators and continue to be valuable although needing evaluation. The researcher found little information pertaining to programs to enhance the self-concept in second grade students. A study of this nature was important to determine if the self-concept of second grade students improved after participation in the Pumsy in Pursuit of Excellence Program.

The results of this study can be used by classroom teachers involved in implementing a program to improve



self-concept in children. The results of this study could provide insight to elementary counselors in planning and implementing classroom participation in the program for continual improvement in self-concept and improvement of low self-esteem in students.

The results of the present study provided information pertaining to the following questions:

- 1. Is there an association between the participation status and measures of self-concept?
- 2. Is there an association between gender and measures of self-concept for those who participated in the program?
- 3. Is there an association between status in Chapter I and measures of self-concept for those who participated?
- 4. Is there an association between family structure (single or intact family) and measures of self-concept for those who participated?

## Composite Null Hypotheses

- All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of signficance.
- 1. The difference between the adjusted post mean Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale (PHCSCS) scores (covariant measure PHCSCS pretest scores) according to participation status will not be statistically significant.
- 2. The difference between the adjusted post mean Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale scores (covariant



measure SRA Reading Total score ) according to participation status will not be statistically significant.

- 3. The difference between the adjusted post mean Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale scores (covariant measure PHCSCS pretest scores) for those who participated according to gender will not be statistically significant.
- 4. The difference between the adjusted post mean Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale scores (covariant measure SRA Reading Total scores) for those who participated according to gender will not be statistically significant.
- 5. The difference between the adjusted post mean Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale scores (covariant measure PHCSCS pretest scores) for those who participated according to status in Chapter I will not be statistically significant.
- 6. The difference between the adjusted post mean Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale scores (covariant measure PHCSCS pretest score) for those who participated according to family structure will not be statistically significant.

Definition of Variables

## Independent Variables

1. Participation status was categorized into two levels:

level one- participant in the Pumsy (experimental group), and



level two- nonparticipant in the Pumsy program (control group).

2. Gender consisted of two levels:

level one- male, and

level two- female.

3. Family structure consisted of two levels:

level one- intact family (original mother and original father), and

level two- other (single parent, stepparent, foster parent, etc.).

4. Chapter I reading status consisted of two levels:

level one- participant, and level two- nonparticipant.

## Dependent Variables

The dependent variables were posttest scores from the following subscales of the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale:

- 1. Behavior-(16 items, possible score 0-16),
- 2. Intellectual & School Status-(17 items, possible score 0-17),
- 3. Physical Appearance & Attributes-(13 items, possible score 0-13),
  - 4. Anxiety-(1: items, possible score 0-14).
  - 5. Popularity-(12 items, possible score 0-12), and



6. Happiness & Satisfaction-(1C items, possible score 0-10).

## Covariant Measures

The covariant measures were pretest scores from the following subscales of the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale and the SRA Survey of Basic Skills Reading Total Score:

- 1. Behavior-(16 items, possible score 0-16),
- Intellectual & School Status-(17 items, possible score 0-17),
- 3. Physical Appearance & Attributes-(13 items, possible score 0-13),
  - 4. Anxiety-(14 items, possible score 0-14),
  - 5. Popularity-(12 items, possible score 0-12),
- Happiness & Satisfaction-(10 items, possible score
   0-10), and
- 7. 1990 SRA Survey of Basic Skills: Reading Total Score obtained from school records-(95 items, possible score 0-95).

## Limitations

The result of the present study might have been affected by:

- (1) the sample was not random,
- (2) subjects participating in the program were from one building in a single school district,



- (3) implementation was conducted by an elementary school counselor,
- (4) the program consisted of 8 class sessions (480 total minutes), and
- (5) extension activities were implemented by regular classroom teachers and the researcher had no control over the procedures used.

## Methodology

## Setting

The study was conducted in a western Kansas community of approximately 17,000 people. The rural farming and oil-producing community is located midway between Denver and Kansas City. Major businesses and industries include Yuasa Exide, Midwest Energy, Dillon Food Stores, and a medical center. A state university is the only four-year university serving the general region. The community has 6 public elementary schools, 2 private elementary schools, 2 middle schools, and 2 high schools (1 public, 1 private).

## <u>Subjects</u>

The sample consisted of students attending 4 elementary schools in a rural setting in western Kansas. For the implementation group, the total number of students attending the elementary school was approximately 435. The control groups came from 3 schools smaller in size and student population.



The sample for the implementation group consisted of 65 second graders (4 sections-16 in 3, 17 in one) and 45 second graders for the control group (3 classrooms-15 students in each) for a total sample of 110.

In the implementation group, 32 were males and 33 were females. Fifty-four of the subjects were living with their natural mother and natural father. The remaining 11 subjects came from another type of family structure (single parent, stepparent, foster parents, etc.). Thirteen of the subjects qualified for Chapter I reading and the remaining 52 did not attend Chapter I reading.

The subjects for the control groups consisted of 22 males and 23 females. Nineteen were living with their natural father and natural mother, while the remaining 26 came from another type of family structure.

## <u>Instruments</u>

Two instruments were employed in the present study.

The instruments were the Piers-Harris Children's

Self-Concept Scale (PHCSCS) and the Science Research

Associates (SRA) Survey of Basic Skills.

Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale (PHCSCS). The PHCSCS was used for the pretest and posttest scores. It is an 80 item, self report questionnaire designed to assess how children feel about themselves. The PHCSCS was developed in the 1960's. The revised test and manual, 1984, was used in the present study.



Children are shown statements that tell how some people feel about themselves and are asked to respond whether each statement applies to them by choosing a "yes" or "no" response. Three summary scores including a total raw score, a percentile score, and an overall stanine score reflect an overall assessment of self-concept. For a more detailed interpretation, 6 cluster scales are provided. These include: Behavior, Intellectual and School Status, Physical Appearance and Attributes, Anxiety, Popularity, and Happiness and Satisfaction.

The manual (Piers-Harris, 1984) contains test-retest reliability data based on the general population and special populations conducted as early as 1964 and continuing into the 1980's. The Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 (KR-20) was employed to estimate internal consistency. The reliability coefficients for the total score derived by this technique ranged from .88 to .93 for various subgroups. The coefficients for the 6 cluster scales ranged from .73 to The alpha coefficient was also employed and found to be .90 for the total score. The manual contains results from numerous studies of reliability (Winne, Mars, & Taylor, 1977; Smith & Rogers, 1978; Franklin, Duley, Rousseau, & Sabers, 1981; all cited by Piers, 1984). Based upon the results of the studies cited in the PHCSCS manual, appeared that the instrument has acceptable reliability.



The manual contained estimates of the content, criterion-related, and construct validity of the PHCSCS from numerous studies (Karnes & Wherry, 1982; Schauer, 1975; Tavormina, 1975; Piers, 1977; and Millen, 1966; all cited by Piers, 1984). The results cited in the manual indicated that the PHCSCS is a valid instrument.

Science Research Associates (SRA) Survey of Basic Skills (SBS). The SRA'S Survey of Basic Skills (SBS) is a battery of norm-referenced, standardized tests in basic curriculum areas for grades K-12 and is designed to survey students' general academic achievement. Normative data were collected in the fall of 1983 and spring of 1984 using the same students in both testings.

SRA makes recommendations pertaining to test levels of the SRA Survey of Basic Skills (SBS) that would be appropriate for students at each grade level. The recommendations are based on test content, reflecting the concepts and topics of widely used curriculum guides and instructional materials. For this research, Reading Total scores came from Level 21, Form P which was 1/2-2/1 (first grade/second semester-second grade/first semester) grade for the average student.

The technical information manual of the SRA's SBS charted numerous raw score statistics. For Level 21, Form P, Grade 1, Spring, the following statistics were given for the Reading Total score: Number of items-95; mean of 66.8;



standard deviation of 16.74; standard error of measurement of 3.80; and, KR-20 (internal consistency reliability coefficients) of .95. Reliability coefficients were based on the Rasch scale scores (SCS).

## Design

A pretest and posttest design was employed. The design was created by the researcher to be used with a program implemented by the elementary school counselor. Independent variables investigated were participation in the Pumsy in Pursuit of Excellence program, gender, family structure, and Chapter I reading status.

Six composite null hypotheses were tested employing an analysis of covariance. The following design was used with each of the 6 composite null hypotheses:

Composite null hypothesis number one—a pretest and posttest control group design with Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale pretest scores as covariant measure,

Composite null hypothesis number two--a pretest and posttest control group design with SRA Reading Total Score as covariant measure.

Composite null hypothesis number three-- a pretest and posttest design for those who participated with gender as the independent variable and Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale pretest scores as covariant measure,

Composite null hypothesis number four--a pretest and posttest design for those who participated with gender as



the independent variable and SRA Reading Total Score as the covariant measure,

Composite null hypothesis number five-- a pretest and posttest design with Chapter I status as the independent variable and Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale pretest scores as the covariant measure, and

Composite null hypothesis number six--a pretest and posttest design with family structure as the independent variable and Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale pretest scores as the covariant measure.

McMillan and Schumacher (1989) cited 10 threats to internal validity. The 10 threats to internal validity were dealt with in the following ways in the present study:

- (1) history- pretest and posttest two-group design was employed;
- (2) selection- students receiving the Pumsy lessons administered by an elementary school counselor were the subjects;
- (3) statistical regression- the sample did not consist of extreme cases;
- (4) testing- all testing was administered under standard conditions;
- (5) instrumentation- students were administered the same pretest and posttest;
- (6) mortality- subjects who had covariant measures and posttest scores were employed:



- (7) maturation- pretest and posttest two-group design was employed;
- (8) diffusion of treatment- the implementation was carried out by an elementary school counselor; thus, the researcher had no control over diffusion of treatment;
- (9) experimental bias- the implementation was carried out by an elementary school counselor and the same directions were given to all subjects according to the testing manual; and
- (10) statistical conclusions- a mathematical assumption was violated, random placement.

McMillan and Schumacher (1989) cited 2 threats to external validity. The 2 threats to external validity were dealt with in the following ways in the present study:

- (1) population external validity- random sampling was not employed; therefore, generalizations should be made only to similar groups; and
- (2) ecological external validity- treatment was administered by the elementary school counselor and each class was read the same set of instructions before beginning the test.

#### Implementation

The Pumsy in Pursuit of Excellence was implemented in the researcher's school during the 1991-92 school year beginning in early November. Two groups of second grade students were used in the study. The implementation group



consisted of 4 second grade classrooms at Roosevelt Elementary School. The control group consisted of second grade students from 3 elementary schools in Unified School District #489.

Sixty-five second grade students (Implementation group) received 8 lessons from the Pumsy program. Each lesson was approximately an hour in duration and each group met every other week. The elementary school counselor implemented the 8 lessons (Appendix A). The control group did not participate in the program.

## Data Collecting Procedures

The researcher obtained oral and written permission to conduct the research (Appendix B). The elementary school counselor, who implemented the program, gave the researcher oral approval. Oral permission was obtained from the regular classroom teachers whose classes were involved in the implementation or in the control group. A letter seeking permission to pretest and posttest the implementation and control groups was sent to parents (Appendix C).

Prior to the beginning of the first implementation in the Pumsy program the students in the 4 second grade classrooms in the implementation group were administered the pretest. The students in the 3 second grade classrooms in the control group were administered the pretest at approximately the same time. At the end of the 8 implementations the classes in the implementation and



control groups were administered the posttest. After the pretests and posttests were administered the researcher scored them. A demographic form for the entire class was compiled by the classroom teacher while the researcher administered the pretest. Demographic information was then coded by the researcher. The results were analyzed by mainframe computer in the Computing Center at Fort Hays State University, Hays, Kansas.

## Research Procedures

The researcher implemented the following operations in the process of conducting the study:

- (1) thesis topic was selected,
- (2) thesis advisor contacted and permission was given to research the effects on self-concept with the implementation of the Pumsy in Pursuit of Excellence program,
- (3) arrangements were made for obtaining data from an ongoing program, Pumsy in Pursuit of Excellence, being implemented by the elementary school counselor,
  - (4) an instrument was selected and approved,
- (5) permission was obtained from building principals, regular classroom teachers, and parents of the students.
- (6) implementation and control groups were established,
  - (7) pretests were administered,
  - (8) Pumsy in Pursuit of Excellence classes began.



- (9) computer searches were made using ERIC and inter-library loan,
  - (10) classes ended and a posttest was given,
- (11) research proposal was compiled, written, and defended,
  - (12) data were analyzed,
  - (13) final research report was written,
- (14) final research was defended before a committee, and
  - (15) final editing of the document.

## Data Analysis

The following were compiled:

- (1) appropriate descriptive statistics,
- (2) one-way analysis of covariance, and
- (3) least square difference of means.

#### Results

The purpose of the researcher was to investigate a self-esteem program implemented by the elementary school counselor with second grade students. Six composite null hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance. Sample size consisted of 110 elementary students. Each null was tested employing a one-way analysis of covariance with pretest scores as the covariate measure in 4 null hypotheses and Reading Total scores as the covariate measure in 2 null hypotheses. Four independent variables were employed in this study. The independent variables were: participation



according to children who participated in the Pumsy program (experimental group) and nonparticipants in the Pumsy program (control group), participation in the according to gender, participation in the program according to family structure, and participation in the program according to Chapter I reading status. The dependent variables were posttest scores from the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale. The test has 6 subscales: Behavior, Intellectual & School Status, Physical Appearance Attributes, Anxiety, Popularity, and Happiness Satisfaction. The covariant measures were pretest scores from the same 6 subscales of the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale and the SRA Survey of Basic Skills Reading Total Score. The result section was organized according to the composite null hypotheses for ease of reference. Information pertaining to each composite null hypothesis was presented in a common format for ease of comparison.

It was hypothesized in composite null hypothesis number one that the difference between the adjusted post-mean Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale scores according to participation status (employing pretest scores as the covariate measure) would not be statistically significant. Table 1 contains information pertaining to composite null hypothesis number one. The following were cited in Table 1: variables, sample sizes, pretest mean scores, pretest



standard deviations, posttest mean scores, posttest standard deviations, adjusted posttest means,  $\underline{F}$  values, and  $\underline{p}$  levels.



Table 1

A Comparison of Adjusted Post Mean Piers-Harris Children's

Self-Concept Scale Scores (PHCSCS) According to

Participation Status with PHCSCS Pretest

Scores as a Covariant Measure Employing

a One-way Analysis of Covariance

| Variable                       | n         | Pretest<br><u>M</u> | Pretest<br><u>s</u> | Post<br><u>M</u> | Post<br><u>s</u> | Adjusted*  | _    | <u>p</u><br>Value |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|------------|------|-------------------|
| <u>Participation</u><br>Status |           |                     | <u>Beh</u> a        | wior**           |                  |            |      |                   |
| Participant                    | 65        | 13.6                | 2.60                | 14.0             | 2.6              | 8 13.9     | 2 48 | .1181             |
| Nonparticipant                 | 45        |                     | 2.94<br>of Regres   | 12.8             | 3.7              | 2 13.0     |      | .0589             |
|                                | 110111    | odenetra            | or kedres           | 21011            |                  |            | 3.04 | .0307             |
| <u>Participation</u><br>Status |           | <u>Intelle</u>      | ctual and           | Schoo            | <u>l Stat</u>    | u <u>s</u> |      |                   |
| Participant                    | 65        | 14.6                | 2.60                | 14.8             | 3.0              | 4 14.5a    |      | .0187             |
| Nonparticipant                 | 45        |                     | 3.60<br>of Regres   | 12.8             | 3.6              | 4 13.2b    |      | .2591             |
|                                | HOIII     | <u>ogenerty</u>     | or kegres           | <u> </u>         |                  |            | 1.27 | .2371             |
| <u>Participation</u><br>Status |           | Physical            | Appearar            | nce & A          | ttribu           | <u>tes</u> |      |                   |
| Participant                    | 65        | 9.7                 | 2.69                | 10.0             | 2.8              | 1 9.9      | N 82 | .3673             |
| Nonparticipant                 | 45<br>Hom |                     | 3.23<br>of Regres   | 9.4              | 3.2              | 0 9.5      |      | .0996             |
|                                | 110       | ogene <u>r</u> er   | or negree           | <u> </u>         |                  |            | 2    | , , , , ,         |
| <u>Participation</u><br>Status |           |                     | <u>Anx i</u>        | ety              |                  |            |      |                   |
| Participant                    | 65        | 10.7                | 2.79                | 11.1             | 3.2              | 1 11.0a    |      | .0359             |
| Nonparticipant                 |           |                     | 3.07                | 9.7              | 3.1              | 1 9.96     |      |                   |
|                                | nom       | ogenerty            | of Regres           | 3510II           |                  |            | 6.23 | .0141             |

(continued)

Table 1 (continued)

| 73- 1-4-3                    |         | Pretest          |                    |                |              | Adjusted* |       | ā      |
|------------------------------|---------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------|-----------|-------|--------|
| Variable                     | ח       | M                | <u>s</u>           | M              | <u>s</u>     | M         | value | Value  |
|                              |         |                  |                    |                |              |           |       |        |
| <u>Participation</u>         |         |                  | <u>Popula</u>      | rity           |              |           |       |        |
| <u>Status</u><br>Parlicipant | 65      | 8.6              | 2.56               | 8.6            | 2.60         | 8.6       |       |        |
| •                            |         |                  |                    |                |              |           | 0.23  | .6360  |
| Nonparticipant               | 45      |                  |                    | 8.2            | 2.71         | 8.4       | 0 00  | 2220   |
|                              | nom     | ogenercy         | of Regres          | <u> </u>       |              |           | 0.80  | .3728  |
| <u>Participation</u>         |         | <u>Happ</u>      | oiness & S         | <u>Satisfa</u> | <u>ction</u> |           |       |        |
| <u>Status</u><br>Participant | 65      | 8.8              | 1.71               | 8.7            | 1.94         | 4 8.6     |       |        |
| raiticipant                  | 65      | 0.0              | 1./1               | 0.7            | 1.94         | 4 0.6     | 0.53  | . 4686 |
| Nonparticipant               |         |                  | 2.44               |                | 2.26         | 8.3       |       |        |
|                              | Hom     | <u>ogenelty</u>  | of Regres          | sion           |              |           | 4.36  | .0391  |
| Participation<br>Status      |         |                  | Compo              | <u>osite</u>   |              |           |       |        |
| Participant Participant      | 65      | 65.8             | 12.27              | 67.3           | 14.29        | 66.4      |       |        |
|                              | 4       | <b>60.4</b>      | 4.4.60             | CO 4           | 10.00        | 7 (1 7    | 3.33  | .0709  |
| Nonparticipant               |         | 62.1<br>ogeneity | 14.60<br>of Regres | 60.4<br>Ssion  | 16.6         | 7 61.7    | 5.61  | .0197  |
|                              | ,,,,,,, | <u> </u>         | ~ 1.V31.V          |                |              |           | 0.01  | .01/1  |

<sup>\*</sup> The higher the score, the stronger the self-concept.

Two of the 7 p values were statistically significant at the .05 level: therefore, the null hypotheses for these comparisons were rejected. The significant comparisons were for the dependent variables Intellectual & School Status and Anxiety. The results cited in Table 1 indicated that the participants in the Pumsy program had higher adjusted post mean scores for Intellectual & School Status and Anxiety than nonparticipants. The assumption of homogeneity of



<sup>\*\*</sup> Possible scores for the 7 components respectively are 0-16, 0-17, 0-13, 0-14, 0-12, 0-10, and 0-82.

ab Means with unlike symbols statistically significant at the .05 level according to least squares means.

regression was met for all comparisons except Anxiety,
Happiness & Satisfaction, and Composite.

It was hypothesized in composite null hypothesis number two that the difference between the adjusted post mean Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale scores according to participation status (employing SRA Reading Total score as the covariant measure) would not be statistically significant. Table 2 contains information pertaining to composite null hypothesis number two. The following were cited in Table 2: variables, sample sizes, covariant means, covariant standard deviations, posttest mean scores, posttest standard deviations, adjusted posttest means, E values, and p levels.



Table 2

A Comparison of Adjusted Post Mean Piers-Harris Children's

Self-Concept Scale Scores According to Participation Status

with SRA Reading Total Scores as a Covariant Measure

Employing a One-way Analysis of Covariance

| Participation Status         Behavior**           Participant         65         13.6         2.60         60.7         24.96         60.6           Nonparticipant         45         13.0         2.94         62.1         24.93         62.4           Homogeneity of Regression         0.76           Participation Status         Intellectual and School Status           Status Participant         65         14.6         2.60         60.8         24.96         60.5           Nonparticipant         45         13.3         3.60         62.1         24.93         62.6  |                   |
|--|-------------------|
| Status         Participant         65         13.6         2.60         60.7         24.96         60.6           Nonparticipant         45         13.0         2.94         62.1         24.93         62.4           Homogeneity of Regression         Intellectual and School Status         0.76           Status         Participant         65         14.6         2.60         60.8         24.96         60.5           Nonparticipant         45         13.3         3.60         62.1         24.93         62.6           Homogeneity of Regression         0.7           Participation         Physical Appearance & Attributes | <u>P</u><br>Value |
| Participant         65         13.6         2.60         60.7         24.96         60.6           Nonparticipant         45         13.0         2.94         62.1         24.93         62.4           Homogeneity of Regression         Intellectual and School Status         0.76           Status         Participant         65         14.6         2.60         60.8         24.96         60.5           Nonparticipant         45         13.3         3.60         62.1         24.93         62.6           Homogeneity of Regression         0.7           Participation         Physical Appearance & Attributes                |                   |
| Nonparticipant         45         13.0         2.94         62.1         24.93         62.4           Homogeneity of Regression         0.76           Participation Status         Intellectual and School Status           Participant         65         14.6         2.60         60.8         24.96         60.5           Nonparticipant         45         13.3         3.60         62.1         24.93         62.6           Homogeneity of Regression         0.7           Participation         Physical Appearance & Attributes   | .7053             |
| Status         Participant         65         14.6         2.60         60.8         24.96         60.5           Nonparticipant         45         13.3         3.60         62.1         24.93         62.6           Homogeneity of Regression         0.7           Participation         Physical Appearance & Attributes   | .4052             |
| Participant         65         14.6         2.60         60.8         24.96         60.5           Nonparticipant         45         13.3         3.60         62.1         24.93         62.6           Homogeneity of Regression         0.7           Participation         Physical Appearance & Attributes  |                   |
| Nonparticipant 45 13.3 3.60 62.1 24.93 62.6  Homogeneity of Regression 0.7  Participation Physical Appearance & Attributes   | .6734             |
|  | .3847             |
| Status   |                   |
| Participant 65 9.7 2.69 60.8 24.96 60.8  | .8027             |
| Nonparticipant 45 9.4 3.23 62.1 24.93 62.0   | .2872             |
| Participation Anxiety Status   |                   |
| <u>Status</u> Participant 65 10.7 2.79 60.8 24.96 60.6   | .7186             |
| Nonparticipant 45 10.2 3.07 62.1 24.93 62.4  | .4555             |

(continued)



Table 2 (continued)

|                         | _    | _                    |                 |                     | D         | 3 -1 : |      |                   |
|-------------------------|------|----------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------|--------|------|-------------------|
| Variable                | n (  | ovariant<br><u>M</u> | Covariant*      | ** Post<br><u>M</u> | Post<br>S | M<br>M |      | <u>p</u><br>Value |
| Participation<br>Status |      |                      | <u>Populari</u> | t <u>y</u>          |           |        |      |                   |
| Participant Participant | 65   | 8.6                  | 2.56            | 60.8                | 24.9      | 6 60.5 | 0.17 | <b>6007</b>       |
| Nonparticipant          | 45   | 8.2                  | 2.22            | 62.1                | 24.9      | 3 62.5 | 0.17 | .6807             |
|                         | Home | ogeneity             | of Regression   | <u>on</u>           |           |        | 0.61 | . 4381            |
| Participation<br>Status |      | <u>Happ</u>          | iness & Sat     | isfactio            | <u>on</u> |        |      |                   |
|                         | 65   | 8.8                  | 1.72            | 60.8                | 24.9      | 6 60.7 |      |                   |
| Nonparticipant          | 45   | 8 1                  | 2.44            | 62 1                | 24.9      | 3 62.3 | 0.10 | .7510             |
| Nonpar crospanc         |      |                      | of Regressi     |                     | 24.7      | 02.0   | 0.25 | .6183             |
| Participation<br>Status |      |                      | Composi         | <u>te</u>           |           |        |      |                   |
| Participant Participant | 65   | 65.8                 | 12.26           | 60.8                | 24.9      | 6 60.5 |      |                   |
| Nonparticipant          | 45   | 62.1                 | 14.60           | 62 1                | 24.9      | 3 62.5 | 0.17 | .6852             |
| nonpar crospanc         |      |                      | of Regressi     |                     | 47./      | 02.0   | 1.37 | .2439             |

<sup>\*</sup> The higher the score, the stronger the self-concept.

None of the 7 p values was statistically significant at the .05 level; therefore, the null hypotheses for these comparisons were retained. Information cited in Table 2 indicated no association between participation (employing SRA Reading Total Score as covariant measure) and any of the 7 dependent variables. The assumption of homogeneity of regression was met for all comparisons.

It was hypothesized in composite null hypothesis number three that the difference between the adjusted post mean



<sup>\*\*</sup> Possible scores for the 7 components respectively are 0-16, 0-17, 0-13, 0-14, 0-12, 0-10, and 0-82.

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> Reading Total Score from SRA Survey of Basic Skills.

Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale scores (covariant measure PHCSCS pretest scores) for those who participated according to gender would not be statistically significant. Table 3 contains information pertaining to composite null hypothesis number three. The following information was cited in Table 3: variables, sample sizes, pretest mean scores, pretest standard deviations, posttest mean scores, posttest standard deviations, adjusted posttest means, F values, and p levels.



Table 3

A Comparison of Adjusted Post Mean Piers-Harris Children's

Self-Concept Scale Scores (PHCSCS) According to Gender with

PHCSCS Pretest Scores as a Covariant Measure

Employing a One-way Analysis of Covariance

| Variable<br>          | n           | Pretest<br><u>M</u> | Pretest<br><u>s</u>     | Post<br><u>M</u>          | Post Ac           | justed*<br><u>M</u> | _         | <u>p</u><br>Value |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| <u>Gender</u>         |             |                     |                         | <u>ior</u> **             |                   |                     |           |                   |
| Male                  | 32          | 13.2                | 2.95                    | 13.3                      | 3.13              | 13.6                | 2 68      | .1070             |
| Female                | 33          | 14.0                | 2.19                    | 14.7                      | 1.98              | 14.4                | 2.00      | . 10 70           |
|                       | <u>Homo</u> | geneity             | of Regres               | <u>sion</u>               |                   |                     | 0.00      | . 9599            |
| Gender                |             | Intelle             | ctual and               | i Schoo                   | l Status          |                     |           |                   |
| Male                  | 32          | 13.8                | 2.98                    | 14.1                      | 3.76              | 14.6                |           |                   |
| Female                | 33          | 15.4                | 1.89                    | 15.5                      | 1.95              | 15.0                | 0.29      | .5946             |
| remare                |             |                     | of Regres               |                           | 1.95              | 15.0                | 0.54      | . 4669            |
|                       |             |                     |                         |                           |                   |                     |           |                   |
| <u>Gender</u><br>Male | 32          | Physical 9.5        | <u>Appearar</u><br>2.99 | <u>1ce &amp; A</u><br>9.5 | ttributes<br>3.05 | 9.6                 |           |                   |
| nare                  | 32          | 7.0                 | 2.77                    | 9.5                       | 3.00              | 9.0                 | 2.01      | .1611             |
| Female                | 33          | 10.0                | 2.38                    | 10.6                      | 2.49              | 10.4                |           | ,                 |
|                       | <u>Homo</u> | geneity             | of Regres               | <u>sion</u>               |                   |                     | 1.28      | . 2625            |
| Gender                |             |                     | AnA                     | riety                     |                   |                     |           |                   |
| Male                  | 32          | 10.5                | 3.10                    | 10.7                      | 3.33              | 10.8                |           |                   |
| Female                | 33          | 10.9                | 2.50                    | 11.5                      | 3.07              | 11.4                | 1.05      | .3105             |
| remare                |             |                     | of Regres               |                           | 3.07              | 11.4                | 0.01      | .9038             |
|                       |             |                     |                         |                           |                   |                     | • • • • • | .,                |
| <u>Gender</u><br>Male | 32          | 8.2                 |                         | arity                     | 2.92              | 8.5                 |           |                   |
| naie                  | 32          | 0.2                 | 2.83                    | 8.3                       | 2.92              | 8.5                 | 0.47      | .9475             |
| Female                | 33          | 8.9                 | 2.27                    | 9.0                       | 2.24              | 8.8                 | • • • •   |                   |
|                       | Homo        | ogeneity            | of Regres               | sion                      |                   |                     | 0.02      | .8883             |
|                       |             |                     | (cont                   | inued)                    |                   |                     |           |                   |





Table 3 (continued)

| Varlable | n           | Pretest<br>M | Pretest<br><u>s</u> | Post<br><u>M</u> | Post<br><u>s</u> | Adjusted*<br><u>M</u> | <u>F</u><br>Value | <u>p</u><br>Value |
|----------|-------------|--------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Gender   | _           | Hap          | piness &            | Şatişf           | action           |                       |                   |                   |
| Male     | 32          | 8.6          | 1.81                | 8.4              | 1.93             | 8 5                   |                   |                   |
|          |             |              |                     |                  |                  |                       | 0.74              | .3945             |
| Female   | 33          | 9.0          | 1.61                | 9.0              | 1.94             | 8.9                   |                   |                   |
|          | <u>Homo</u> | ogeneity     | of Regres           | <u>ssion</u>     |                  |                       | 5.37              | .0238             |
| Gender   |             |              | Compos              | site             |                  |                       |                   |                   |
| Male     | 32          | 63.7         | 14.09               | 64.2             | 16.04            | 4 65.9                |                   |                   |
|          |             |              |                     |                  |                  |                       | 1.13              | .0709             |
| Female   | 33          | 67.8         | 9.96                | 70.3             | 11.86            | 68.6                  |                   |                   |
|          | Homo        | ogeneity     | of Regres           | ssion            |                  |                       | 0.62              | .4359             |

<sup>\*</sup> The higher the score, the stronger the self-concept.

None of the 7 p values were statistically significant at the .05 level; therefore, the null hypotheses for these comparisons were retained. Information cited in Table 3 indicated no association between participation according to gender (employing PHCSCS pretest scores as covariant measure) and any of the 7 dependent variables. The assumption of homogeneity of regression was met for all comparisons except Happiness & Satisfaction.

It was hypothesized in composite null hypothesis number four that the difference between the adjusted post mean Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale Scores according to participation status (employing SRA Reading Total score as the covariant measure) would not be statistically significant. Table 4 contains information pertaining to



<sup>\*\*</sup> Possible scores for the 7 components respectively are 0-16, 0-17, 0-13, 0-14, 0-12, 0-10, and 0-82.

composite null hypothesis number four. The following were cited in Table 4: variables, sample sizes, covariant means, covariant standard deviations, posttest mean scores, posttest standard deviations, adjusted posttest means,  $\underline{F}$  values, and  $\underline{p}$  levels.



Table 4

A Comparison of Adjusted Post Mean Piers-Harris Children's
Self-Concept Scale Scores According to Gender with SRA
Reading Total Scores as a Covariant Measure Employing
a One-way Analysis of Covariance

| Variable                              | n      | Covariant<br><u>M</u> | Covariant***          | Post<br>M        | Post Ad | justec<br><u>M</u> | i* <u>F</u> <u>p</u><br>Value Value |
|---------------------------------------|--------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Participation<br>Status               |        |                       | Behavior              | * <b>*</b>       |         |                    |                                     |
| Participant                           | 32     | 13.2                  | 2.95                  | 55.5             | 26.24   | 56.1               | 2.27 .1368                          |
| Nonparticipant                        |        |                       | 2.19<br>of Regression |                  | 22.90   | 65.4               | 0.54 .4637                          |
| Participation                         | 110111 |                       | ctual and Sch         |                  | tatus   | ,                  |                                     |
| <u>Status</u><br>Participant          | 32     |                       | 2.98                  | 55.5             |         | 56.2               |                                     |
| Nonparticipant                        | 33     |                       | 1.89                  | 65.9             | 22.90   | 65.2               | 1.95 .1680                          |
|                                       |        | <u>ogeneity</u>       | of Regression         | L                |         |                    | 1.00 .3214                          |
| <u>Participation</u><br><u>Status</u> |        | <u>Physical</u>       | Appearance 8          | <u>Attr</u>      |         |                    |                                     |
| Participant                           | 32     | 9.5                   | 2.99                  | 55.5             |         | 55.6               | 2.69 .1060                          |
| Nonparticipant                        |        | 10.0<br>ogeneity      | 2.38<br>of Regression |                  | 22.90   | 65.8               | 1.48 .2288                          |
| <u>Participation</u>                  |        |                       | <u>Anxiety</u>        |                  |         |                    |                                     |
| <u>Status</u><br>Participant          | 32     | 10.5                  | 3.10                  | 55.5             | 26.24   | 55.8               |                                     |
| Nonparticipant                        |        |                       | 2.50                  |                  | 22.90   | 65.6               |                                     |
| Doublatable                           | HOM    | ogeneity              | of Regression         |                  |         |                    | 0.76 .3882                          |
| Participation Status                  | 20     |                       | Popularity            | <u>/</u><br>55.5 | 26.24   | 55.3               |                                     |
| Participant                           |        |                       | 2.83                  | 65.9             |         | 65.2               | 2.18 .1451                          |
| Nonparticipant                        |        |                       | 2.27<br>of Regression |                  | 22.70   | 00.4               | 1.35 .2500                          |
|                                       |        |                       |                       |                  |         |                    |                                     |

(continued)

Table 4 (continued)

| Variable                | Co<br>n           | ovariant<br><u>M</u> | Covariant***<br><u>S</u>     | Post<br><u>M</u> | Post Ad  | ljusted<br><u>M</u> | d* <u>F</u> <u>p</u><br>Value Value |
|-------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------|----------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Participation           | _                 | Нарр                 | iness & Satis                | factio           | on       |                     |                                     |
| Status<br>Participant   | 32                | 8.6                  | 1.81                         | 55,5             | <u> </u> | 55.7                |                                     |
| -                       |                   |                      |                              |                  |          |                     | 2.63 .1102                          |
| Nonparticipant          | 33<br><u>Homo</u> | 9.0<br>geneity (     | 1.61<br><u>of Regression</u> | 65.9             | 22.90    | 65.7                | 0.01 .9237                          |
| Participation<br>Status |                   |                      | <u>Composite</u>             |                  |          |                     |                                     |
| Participant             | 32                | 63.7                 | 14.09                        | 55,5             | 26.24    | 56.2                |                                     |
| Nonparticipant          | 33                | 67.8                 | 9.96                         | 65.9             | 22.90    | 65.2                | 2.12 .1500                          |
|                         | <u>Homo</u>       | geneity (            | of Regression                |                  |          |                     | 1.20 .2778                          |

<sup>\*</sup> The higher the score, the stronger the self-concept.

None of the 7 p values was statistically significant at the .05 level; therefore, the null hypotheses for these comparisons were retained. Information cited in Table 4 indicated no association between participation according to gender (employing SRA Reading Total Score as covariant measure) and any of the 7 dependent variables. The assumption of homogeneity of regression was met for all comparisons.

It was hypothesized in composite null hypothesis number five that the difference between the adjusted post mean Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale scores (covariant measure PHCSCS pretest scores) for those who participated



<sup>\*\*</sup> Possible scores for the 7 components respectively are 0-16, 0-17, 0-13, 0-14, 0-12, 0-10, and 0-82.

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> Reading Total Score from SRA Survey of Basic Skills.

according to Chapter 1 status would not be statistically significant. Table 5 contains information pertaining to composite null hypothesis number five. The following information was cited in Table 5: variables, sample sizes, pretest mean scores, pretest standard deviations, posttest mean scores, posttest standard deviations, adjusted posttest means, E values, and p levels.



Table 5

A Comparison of Adjusted Post Mean Piers-Harris Children's

Self-Concept Scale Scores (PHCSCS) According to

Chapter I Status with PHCSCS Pretest Scores

as a Covariant Measure Employing a One-way

Analysis of Covariance

| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |    |                        |                     |                  |                  |                       |                   |        |
|---------------------------------------|----|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------|
| Variable                              | n  | Pretest<br><u>M</u>    | Pretest<br><u>s</u> | Post<br><u>M</u> | Post<br><u>s</u> | Adjusted*<br><u>M</u> | <u>F</u><br>Value |        |
| Chapter I<br>Status                   | -  |                        | <u>Be</u>           | <u>navior</u> *  | *                |                       |                   |        |
|                                       | 13 | 13.2                   | 3.67                | 13.7             | 2.46             | 5 14.0                | 0.00              | ,9894  |
| Nonparticipant                        |    |                        | 2.29<br>of Regres   |                  | 2.74             | 4 14.0                |                   | .3054  |
| <u>Chapter I</u><br>Status            |    | Intelle                | ectual and          | d Schoo          | l Stati          | 12                    |                   |        |
|                                       | 13 | 14.3                   | 3.82                | 15.9             | 1.19             | 9 <b>1</b> 6.1a       |                   | .0397  |
| Nonparticipant                        |    |                        | 2.43<br>of Regres   |                  | 3.2              | 9 14.5b               | *                 | .0231  |
| <u>Chapter I</u><br>Status            |    | Physical               | l Appearai          | nce & A          | ttribu           | <u>tes</u>            |                   |        |
|                                       | 13 | 10.4                   | 3.25                | 10.8             | 2.5              | 1 10.4                | 0.50              | . 4829 |
| Nonparticipant                        |    | 9.6<br><u>ogeneity</u> | 2.55<br>of Regres   |                  | 2.8              | 7 9.9                 |                   | .1212  |
| <u>Chapter I</u><br>Status            |    |                        | <u>A</u> i          | <u>nxiety</u>    |                  |                       |                   |        |
|                                       | 13 | 11.5                   | 2.66                | 11.4             | 3.0              | 1 10.8                | 0.35              | .5556  |
| Nonparticipant                        |    |                        | 2.82<br>of Regre    |                  | 3.2              | 7 11.2                |                   | .5871  |
|                                       |    |                        | (cont               | inued)           |                  |                       |                   |        |



Table 5 (continued)

| Variable                          | n                | Pretest<br><u>M</u> | Pretest<br><u>s</u> | Post<br><u>M</u>    | Post<br>§    | Adjusted*<br><u>M</u> | <u>F</u><br>Value | <u>p</u><br>Value |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Chapter I                         |                  |                     | <u>Popul</u>        | arity               | _            |                       |                   |                   |
| <u>Status</u><br>Participant      | 13               | 9.1                 | 1.85                | 9.5                 | 1.81         | 9.1                   |                   |                   |
| •                                 |                  |                     |                     |                     |              |                       | 0.91              | .3443             |
| Nonparticipant                    | 52<br><u>Hom</u> |                     | 2.71<br>of Regres   | 8.4<br><u>ssion</u> | 2.75         | 8.5                   | 0.00              | .9860             |
| <u>Chapter I</u><br>Status        |                  | Happ                | oiness & S          | Satisfa             | <u>ction</u> |                       |                   |                   |
| Participant                       | 13               | 9.1                 | 1.98                | 9.0                 | 2.24         | 8.8                   | በ 13              | .7246             |
| Nonparticipant                    | 52<br>Hom        |                     | 1.66<br>of Regres   | 8.6                 | 1.88         | 8.7                   |                   | .0111             |
| Charter I                         | 110111           | <u>ogenercy</u>     |                     |                     |              |                       | 0,00              | .0111             |
| <u>Chapter I</u><br><u>Status</u> |                  |                     | <u>Con</u>          | posite              | -            |                       |                   |                   |
| Participant                       | 13               | 66.7                | 14.62               | 70.3                | 11.47        | 7 69.5                | ດ ຄວ              | .3672             |
| Nonparticipant                    | 52               | 65.6                | 11.75               | 66.5                | 14.92        | 2 66.7                | 0.03              | .3012             |
|                                   | <u>Hom</u>       | ogeneity            | of Regres           | sion                |              |                       | 1.20              | .2769             |
|                                   |                  |                     |                     |                     |              |                       |                   |                   |

<sup>\*</sup> The higher the score, the stronger the self-concept.

One of the 7 p values was statistically significant at the .05 level; therefore, the null hypothesis for this comparison was rejected. The significant comparison was for the dependent variable Intellectual & School Status. The results cited in Table 5 indicated that the participants in Chapter I had higher adjusted post mean scores for Intellectual & School Status than nonparticipants. The assumption of homogeneity of regression was met for all



<sup>\*\*</sup> Possible scores for the 7 components respectively are 0-16, 0-17, 0-13, 0-14, 0-12, 0-10, and 0-82.

 $<sup>\,</sup>$  ab Means with unlike symbols statistically significant at the .05 level according to least squares means.

comparisons except Intellectual & School Status and Happiness & Satisfaction.

It was hypothesized in composite null hypothesis number six that the difference between the adjusted post mean Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale according to family structure status (employing SRA Reading Total score as the covariate measure) would not be statistically significant. Table 6 contains information pertaining to composite null hypothesis number six. The following were cited in Table 6: variables, sample sizes, pretest mean scores, pretest standard deviations, posttest mean scores, posttest standard deviations, adjusted posttest means, <u>F</u> values, and <u>p</u> levels.



Table б

A Comparison of Adjusted Post Mean Piers-Harris Children's

Self-Concept Scale Scores (PHCSCS) According to Family

Structure with PHCSCS Pretest Scores as a Covariant

Measure Employing a One-way Analysis of Covariance

| Variable               | n           | Pretest<br><u>M</u> | Pretest<br><u>s</u> | Post<br><u>M</u> | Post<br><u>s</u> | Adjusted*         |      | <u>p</u><br>Value |
|------------------------|-------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|------|-------------------|
| Family Struct          | ture        |                     | <u>Beha</u>         | avior**          | <b>†</b>         | -                 |      |                   |
| Intact                 | 54          | 14.0                | 2.12                | 14.1             | 2.63             | 3 13.9            | 0.74 | 00.40             |
| Other                  | .11         |                     | 4.00                |                  | 2.94             | 14.5              |      | .3943             |
|                        | Home        | ogeneity            | of Regres           | sion             |                  |                   | 0.02 | . 8859            |
| Chapter I<br>Status    |             | Intelle             | ectual and          | d Schoo          | ol Statu         | 1 <u>2</u>        |      |                   |
| Intact                 | 54          | 14.8                | 2.28                | 14.8             | 3.26             | 5 14.7            | n 8n | .3735             |
| Other                  |             |                     | 3.80                |                  | 1.66             | 5 15.5            |      |                   |
|                        | <u>Hom</u>  | <u>ogeneity</u>     | of Regres           | ssion            |                  |                   | 5.47 | .0226             |
| Family Struc<br>Status | <u>ture</u> | <u> </u>            | Physical <i>I</i>   | <u>Appeara</u>   | nce & A          | <u>Attributes</u> |      |                   |
| Intact                 | 54          | 10.0                | 2.48                | 10.1             | 2.83             | 9.9               |      |                   |
| Other                  | 11          | 8.4                 | 3.35                | 9.6              | 2.80             | 0 10.6            | 0.91 | .3449             |
|                        | <u>Horn</u> | <u>ogeneity</u>     | of Regres           | <u>ssion</u>     |                  |                   | 0.58 | .4484             |
| Family Struc<br>Status | ture        |                     | <u>An</u>           | <u>xiety</u>     | •                |                   |      |                   |
| Intact                 | 54          | 10.9                | 2.71                | 11.4             | 2.9              | 2 11.2            | 0 50 | . 4453            |
| Other                  | 11          | 9.5                 | 3.01                | 9.6              | 4.2              | 3 10.6            |      |                   |
|                        | <u>Hom</u>  | <u>ogeneity</u>     | of Regre            | ssion            |                  |                   | 4.87 | .0311             |
|                        |             |                     | (cont               | inued)           |                  |                   |      |                   |

(continued)



Table 6 (continued)

|                         |            | Pretest         | Pretest           | Post     | Post     | Adjusted*     |       |        |
|-------------------------|------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------|----------|---------------|-------|--------|
| Variable                | n          | <u>M</u>        | <u>s</u>          | <u>M</u> | <u>s</u> | M             | Value | Value  |
| Family Structu          | ıre        |                 | Popu              | ılarity  |          |               |       | ·      |
| Status                  |            |                 |                   |          |          |               |       |        |
| Intact                  | 54         | 8.7             | 2.44              | 8.8      | 2.6      | 5 8.7         |       |        |
| 044                     | 4.4        | 7.0             | 2.44              | 7.9      | 2.2      | 4 0.0         | 0.31  | .5825  |
| Other                   |            | 7.9<br>ogeneity | 3.14<br>of Regres |          | 2.3      | 4 8.3         | 0.14  | .7048  |
| Family Structu          | ure        |                 | <u>Happir</u>     | iess &   | Satisf   | <u>action</u> |       |        |
| <u>Status</u><br>Intact | 54         | 8.9             | 1.46              | 8.8      | 1.8      | 1 8.7         | n 29  | .5938  |
| Other                   | 11         | 8.1             | 2.64              | 8.1      | 2.5      | 1 8.4         | 0.27  | .0750  |
|                         |            |                 | of Regres         |          |          |               | 1.09  | .3000  |
| Family Structu          | <u>ire</u> |                 | <u>Com</u> r      | osite    |          |               |       |        |
| <u>Status</u><br>Intact | 54         | 67.1            | 10.73             | 68.1     | 14.2     | 9 66.9        |       |        |
| <b>.</b>                |            |                 |                   |          |          |               | 0.38  | .5406  |
| Other                   | 11         |                 | 17.21             |          | 14.3     | 9 69.0        | 4 44  | . 2963 |
|                         | пош        | ogenerty        | of <u>Regres</u>  | 221011   |          |               | 1.11  | .2703  |

<sup>\*</sup> The higher the score, the stronger the self-concept.

None of the 7 p values were statistically signficant at the .05 level; therefore, the null hypotheses for these comparisons were retained. The results cited in Table 6 indicated no association beween participation according to family structure (employing PHCSCS scores as covariant measure) and any of the 7 dependent variables. The assumption of homogeneity of regression was met for all comparisons except Intellectual & School Status and Anxiety.



<sup>\*\*</sup> Possible scores for the 7 components respectively are 0-16, 0-17, 0-13, 0-14, 0-12, 0-10, and 0-82.

#### Discussion

The purpose of the researcher was to investigate a self-esteem program implemented by the elementary school counselor with second grade students. The independent variables investigated were participation status (two levels: experimental and control groups); gender (two levels); family structure (two levels: participant and nonparticipant). The dependent variables were posttest scores from the following subscales of the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale: Behavior, Intellectual & School Status, Physical Appearance & Attributes, Anxiety, Popularity, and Happiness & Satisfaction. The covariant measures were pretest scores from the previous subscales of the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale and the SRA Survey of Basic Skills Reading Total score. The sample consisted of 110 second grade students. Six composite null hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance. Each composite null hypothesis was tested with a one-way factor analysis of covariance.

Of the 42 comparisons made, 3 were statistically significant at the .05 level. The 3 significant comparisons were the following: participation for the dependent variable Intellectual & School Status; participation for the dependent variable Anxiety; and Chapter I reading status for the dependent variable Intellectual & School Status. The results of the significant comparisons indicated the



following: participants in the program had a higher adjusted post means score for Intellectual & School Status and Anxiety than nonparticipants and participants in Chapter I reading had a higher adjusted post mean score for Intellectual & School Status than nonparticipants.

Results of the present study gave partial support to the findings reported by Lewis (1984) that implementation groups showed a positive, although no statistially significant gain in Chapter I reading. The results from the present study indicated that participants in Chapter I had a higher adjusted post means score for Intellectual & School Status than did nonparticipants.

The results of the present study appeared to expand upon the findings of Harmon (1989) which indicated no significant differences at the .05 level between the experiemental and control groups. In the present study, three significant comparisons were found when looking at the 7 subscales in the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale. A significant gain was reported in Intellectual & School Status and Anxiety by the participants in the program. Participants in the program and Chapter I had a higher post means score for Intellectual & School Status. Harmon's study was conducted with third grade students over a period of 8 weeks. The present study was with second grade students with the implementation being conducted over 16 weeks.



In the researcher's opinion gains were made by the participants in the program even though only 3 comparisons were statistically significant with the instrument employed. Observations by the researcher included the following student behaviors: frequent use of the terminology in solving conflict, increased willingness to discuss personal experiences to illustrate the concepts, and application of the concepts in daily experiences.

The results of the present study appeared to support the following generalizations:

- (1) Participation status (Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale Scores as covariant measure) was associated with 2 dimensions of self-concept (Intellectual & School Status and Anxiety).
- (2) Participation status (SRA Reading Total Scores as covariant measure) was not associated with self-concept.
- (3) For those who participated in the implementation (Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale Scores as covariant measure) gender was not associated with self-concept.
- (4) For those who participated in the implementation (SRA Reading Total Scores as covariant measure) gender was not associated with self-concept.
- (5) For those who participated in the implementation (Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale Scores as



covariant measure) Chapter I was associated with 1 dimension of self-concept (Intellectual & School Status).

(6) For those who participated in the implementation (Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale Scores as covariant measure) family structure was not associated with self-concept.

Additional studies of this nature should be conducted to identify the effect of gender, family structure, and reading achievement on self-concept. The results of the present study appeared to support the following recommendations:

- (1) The study should be replicated employing random placement of the subjects.
- (2) The study should be replicated employing random samples from more than one geographical location.
- (3) The study should be replicated employing other independent variables, such as students who qualify for free and reduced lunches.
- (4) The study should be replicated with consistent extension activities employed by classroom teachers.
- (5) The study should be replice and with implementation being conducted weekly for 30 minutes and extending through the school year.



### References

- Anderson, J. (1982). <u>Pumsy in pursuit of excellence</u>. Eugene, Oregon: Timberline Press. Inc..
- Briggs, D.C. (1970). <u>Your child's self-esteem</u>. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.
- Brookover, W. (1964). Self-concept of ability and school achievement. Sociology of Education, 37, 271-278.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Dinkmeyer, D. (1970). <u>Developing understanding of self and others</u>, D-1 & D-2. Circle Pines, Minnesota: American Guidance Service.
- Eldridge, M., Barcikowski, R., & Witmer, J. (1973). Effects of DUSO on self-concept of second grade students.

  Elementary School Guidance & Counseling, 7, 256-260.
- Harmon, D.A. (1989). Measurement of effects on self-concept following participation in Pumsy in pursuit of excellence program. Unpublished master's thesis, Central Missouri State University.
- Hutchinson, R.L. (1987). The effects of family structure on institutionalized children's self-concept. Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 291 980)
- Johnson, M.K., Hutchinson, R.L. (1987). <u>Effects of family</u> structure on children's self-concepts. Midwestern



- Psychological Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 291 979)
- Kovalt & Hales, L. (1972). The effects of DUSO program and self-concepts on primary school children. Child Study Journal, 2, 57-61.
- Lewis, H.W. (1984). A structured group counseling program for reading disabled elementary students. The School Counselor, 31, 454-459.
- McMillan, J.H., & Schumacher, S. (1989). Research in education: A conceptual introduction (2nd Edition).

  Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Parish, T.S. (1991). Ratings of self and parents by youth:

  Are they affected by family status, gender, and birth order? Adolescence, 26, 105-112.
- Patterson, C.H. (1986). <u>Theories of counseling and psychotherapy</u>. New York, NY: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc..
- Phillips, S. (1983). Self-concept and self-esteem: Infancy
  to adolescence. A cognitive developmental outline with
  some reference to behavior and health effects.
  Kensington, Australia: New South Wales University,
  School of Education.
- Piers, E.V. (1984). <u>Piers-Harris children's self-concept</u>

  <u>scale revised manual</u>. Los Angeles, California: Wester

  Psychological Services.



- Purkey, W.W. (1970). <u>Self-concept and school achievement</u>. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Revicki, D.A., (1982). The relationship between self concept and achievement: An investigation of reciprocal effects. American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 219 440)
- Science Research Associates (1985). <u>Survey of Basic Skills.</u>

  <u>Technical Information</u>. Science Research Associates,

  Inc., United States of America.
- Silvernail, D. (1985). <u>Developing positive student self</u>
  concept. National Education Association: Washington,
  D.C.
- Stafford, W.B., & Hill, J.D. (1989). Flanned program to foster positive self-concepts in kindergarten children.

  <u>Elementary School Guidance & Counseling</u>, 24, 47-57.
- Summerlin, M.L., Hammett V.L., & Payne, M.L. (1983). The effects of magic-circle participation on a child's self-concept. The School Counselor, 49-52.
- Wattenberg, W.W. & Clifford, C. (1964). Relation of self-concept to beginning achievement in reading. Child Development, 35, 461-467.



# Appendix A

Pumsy in Pursuit of Excellence Unit Objectives



Pumsy in Pursuit of Excellence Unit Objectives, (Anderson, 1982)

Unit I: Pumsy Decides

- (1) Children will be able to identify in themselves three qualities found in Pumsy's thinking: the Sparkler Mind, the Clear Mind, and the Mud Mind.
- (2) Children will be able to recognize whether they are in their Clear Mind or in their Mud Mind.

Unit 2: If Only Things Were Different

- (1) Children will recognize some of the different areas of their lives in which they think, :If only things were different."
- (2) Children will identify one thing in their life that they wish they could change but cannot change.
- (3) Children will replace "If only (x) were different" thoughts with new and more positive thoughts.
- (4) Children will recognize an improvement in their feelings when they use the new language structure.

Unit 3: I Can't Stand It!

- (1) Children will identify specific situations that tend to throw them out of control, ruin their day, or leave them feeling miserable.
- (2) Children will begin replacing negative thought patterns with more positive thought patterns.



(3) Children will identify specific difficult situations that they generally handle well.

Unit 4: I'm No Good.

- (1) Children will be able to recognize and acknowledge when they are feeling sorry for themselves.
- (2) Children will make a conscious choice to stop feeling sorry for themselves.
- (3) Children will expand their pool of activities that can help them feel better about themselves.

Unit 5: It's Not My Fault.

- (1) Children will be able to determine areas where they have both responsibility and consequences.
- (2) Children will be able to determine areas where they have no control or responsibility and therefore should not feel liable for the outcome.

Unit 6: Why Didn't It Work?

- (1) Children will ask themselves, "Am I doing what I need to do?"
- (2) On a simple level, children will be able to evaluate a situation in which someone does not succeed in meeting goals. They will make a simple determination of what ingredient is missing: positive thinking or positive doing. Unit 7: But What If I Say No
- (1) Children will be able to differentiate between two kinds of "No", responding to a simple question or



expressing a preference, and using "No" to preserve their integrity, protect their bodies, and enhance self-esteem.

(2) Children will be able to say "No" when necessary to preserve their integrity, protect their bodies, and enhance their self-esteem

Unit 8: Pumsy Helps Friend

(1) Children will be able to give support to friends when they need help.



Appendix B

Administrative Permission Letters



November 11, 1991

Mr. Dale Koerner, Principal Roosevelt Elementary 2000 MacArthur Hays, KS 67601

Dear Mr. Koerner,

Thank you for allowing me to conduct a study with the Roosevelt second graders who are participating in the Pumsy in Pursuit of Excellence program. The purpose of this study is to determine the effects on self-concept as measured by the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale. In order for me to keep accurate records of permission that has been granted, I would appreciate your signature at the bottom of this page.

After completion of this study, I would be glad to discuss the results with you.

Thank you again for your support in this study.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Jan Burkholder

7/11 Gan Burkholde



I, <u>lall location</u>, give permission for this study to determine the effects on self-concept as measured by the Piers-Harris Childrens's Self-Concept Scale.

November 11, !991

Mrs. Joyce Darnell, Principal Lincoln Elementary 1906 Ash Hays, KS 67601

Dear Mrs. Darnell,

Thank you for allowing me to conduct a study with the second grade at Lincoln Elementary. I will be using this group as a control group in a study to determine the effects on self-concept as measured by the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale. The experimental group, located at Roosevelt Elementary, will be exposed to eight sessions of the Pumsy in Pursuit of Excellence program.

In order for me to keep accurate records of permission that has been granted, I would appreciate your signature at the bottom of this page.

After completion of this study, I would be glad to discuss the results with you.

Thank you again for your support in this study.

Sincerely.

Miss from Experiedad

Mrs. Jan Burkholder



I, <u>Principal</u>, give permission for this study to determine the effects on self-concept as measured by the Piers-Harris Childrens's Self-Concept Scale.

November 11, 1991

Mrs. Tanya Channell, Principal Kathryn O'Loughlin McCarthy Elementary 1410 Hall Hays, KS 67601

Dear Mrs. Channell,

Thank you for allowing me to conduct a study with the second grade at O'Loughlin Elementary. I will be using this group as a control group in a study to determine the effects on self-concept as measured by the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale. The experimental group, located at Roosevelt Elementary, will be exposed to eight sessions of the Pumsy in Pursuit of Excellence program.

In order for me to keep accurate records of permission that has been granted, I would appreciate your signature at the bottom of this page.

After completion of this study, I would be glad to discuss the results with you.

Thank you again for your support in this study.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Jan Burkholder

Mas for buterided

I, <u>Mind Control Since</u>, give permission for this study to determine the effects on self-concept as measured by the Piers-Harris Childrens's Self-Concept Scale.

November 11, 1991

Mr. Allen Park, Principal Washington Elementary 305 Main Hays, KS 67601

Dear Mr. Park,

Thank you for allowing me to conduct a study with the second grade at Washington Elementary. I will be using this group as a control group in a study to determine the effects on self-concept as measured by the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale. The experimental group, located at Roosevelt Elementary, will be exposed to eight sessions of the Pumsy in Pursuit of Excellence program.

In order for me to keep accurate records of permission that has been granted, I would appreciate your signature at the bottom of this page.

After completion of this study, I would be glad to discuss the results with you.

Thank you again for your support in this study.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Jan Burkholder

Mis Oan Bulenideu

I, <u>((C. Tark)</u>, give permission for this study to determine the effects on self-concept as measured by the Piers-Harris Childrens's Self-Concept Scale.



Appendix C

Parental Permission Letters



November 13, 1991

Dear Parents of Roosevelt Second Graders:

In addition to teaching second grade at Roosevelt Elementary, I am currently pursuing a master's degree in elementary counseling from Fort Hays State University. The final step of the program requires me to write a thesis. The area I have chosen for study is the current Pumsy in Pursuit of Excellence program that is used with the second grades at Roosevelt.

The purpose of the study is to determine the effects on self-concept of children who participate in the program. As a scale of measurement the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale will be administered. Mrs. Lesley Schonthaler, Roosevelt counselor, will present eight sessions in the program to the second grade students. The control group from other Hays second grade classrooms will not participate in the eight sessions.

Thank you for your cooperation in this study. If you have any questions please feel free to call. Results of the study will be available in the summer of 1992 at Forsyth Library at Fort Hays State University.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Jan Burkholder

Home phone: 628-1448

7100 - Jan Brownieder

November 18, 1991

Dear Parents,

I am currently pursuing a master's degree in elementary counseling from Fort Hays State University. The final step of the program requires me to write a thesis. Because a positive self concept is so important for children, I have chosen this area for my study.

The administration has agreed to allow the study at O'Loughlin Elementary. Your child's class will be serving as a control group in the study. I will be administering the Piers Harris Self Concept Scale to all students in your child's class. The test will be administered during school hours and last thirty minutes. Confidentiality will be insured by eliminating the children's names.

Thank you for your help in this study. If you have any questions please feel free to call. Unless I hear from you, I will assume you are agreeable to your child's participation.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Jan Burkholder

Miss. Jan Buckhitch

628-1448



November 18, 1991

Dear Parents,

I am currently pursuing a master's degree in elementary counseling from Fort Hays State University. The final step of the program requires me to write a thesis. Because a positive self concept is so important for children, I have chosen this area for my study.

The administration has agreed to allow the study at Lincoln Elementary. Your child's class will be serving as a control group in the study. I will be administering the Piers Harris Self Concept Scale to all students in your child's class. The test will be administered during school hours and last thirty minutes. Confidentiality will be insured by eliminating the children's names.

Thank you for your help in this study. If you have any questions please feel free to call. Unless I hear from you, I will assume you are agreeable to your child's participation.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Jan Burkholder

Miss. Spin Blunkhedden

628-1448

November 18, 1991

Dear Parents,

I am currently pursuing a master's degree in elementary counseling from Fort Hays State University. The final step of the program requires me to write a thesis. Because a positive self concept is so important for children, I have chosen this area for my study.

The administration has agreed to allow the study at Washington Elementary. Your child's class will be serving as a control group in the study. I will be administering the Piers Harris Self Concept Scale to all students in your child's class. The test will be administered during school hours and last thirty minutes. Confidentiality will be insured by eliminating the children's names.

Thank you for your help in this study. If you have any questions please feel free to call. Unless I hear from you, I will assume you are agreeable to your child's participation.

Sincerely.

Mrs. Jan Burkholder

628-1448

